

**REMARKS**

Favorable reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested in light of the amendments and remarks herein.

Upon entry of this amendment, claims 1, 2, 4-12, 14, 15, and 17-36 will be pending. By this amendment, claims 3, 13, and 16 have been canceled; and claims 1, 12, 17, 31, 35, and 36 have been amended. No new matter has been added.

**§112 Rejection of Claim 13**

On page 2 of the Office Action, claim 13 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph. Claim 13 has been canceled.

**§102 Rejection of Claims 1-21, 23-27, 31-33, and 35-36**

In Section 2 of the Office Action, claims 1-21, 23-27, 31-33, and 35-36 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Lumera *et al.* (U.S. Patent Application No. 2004/0083377; hereinafter referred to as “Lumera”). Claims 1, 12, 31, and 35-36 have been amended to address the rejection.

In the Background section of the Specification, it was disclosed that “[t]he emergence of a growing number of media players has created a widening gap between the richness of the various types of media content and the diverse capabilities of the client devices to handle the content. As a result, the technology selection process for the end user has become quite complicated. For example, the user often cannot be certain that a given media player will be able to play the type of media content in which he or she is interested. Also, the user may be required

to frequently download new media playing software in order to access desired content.”

*Background of the Specification, page 2, lines 8-14.*

To solve the above-stated problem, embodiments of the present invention provide content management systems, methods, and programs for media publishing. For example, the structure of system claim 1, as presented herein, includes:

*“a plurality of content management tools* for managing media contents during a publication process;

*a publishing pipeline* configured to operate in concert with said plurality of content management tools during the publication process to control development, distribution, and access of the media contents,

wherein said publishing pipeline provides a plurality of environments for staged and organized development and publication of the media contents;  
and

*a producer* configured to generate and edit templates of media items and associated data when the plurality of environments is in a development/production environment,

wherein each template of said templates includes a number of media slots, and each media slot defines a genre of media and a specific target format.

(emphasis added)

In summary, the structure of system claim 1 includes a plurality of content management tools; a publishing pipeline; and a producer configured to generate and edit templates of media items and associated data when the plurality of environments is in a development/production environment. Each template includes a number of media slots, and each media slot defines a genre of media and a specific target format.

By contrast, Lumera fails to teach or suggest generating and editing templates of media items and associated data when the plurality of environments is in a development/production environment, wherein each template includes a number of media slots, and each media slot

defines a genre of media and a specific target format.

Based on the foregoing discussion, Lumera fails to teach or suggest all the limitations recited in claim 1. Therefore, claim 1 should be allowable over Lumera. Further, since independent claims 12, 31, 35, and 36 closely parallel, and include substantially similar limitations as recited in, claim 1, claims 12, 31, 35, and 36 should also be allowable over Lumera. Since claims 2, 4-11, 14, 15, 17-21, 23-27, 32-33 depend from one of claims 1, 12, and 31, claims 2, 4-11, 14, 15, 17-21, 23-27, 32-33 should also be allowable over Lumera. Claims 3, 13, and 16 have been canceled.

Accordingly, it is submitted that the rejection of claims 1-21, 23-27, 31-33, and 35-36 based upon 35 U.S.C. §102(e) has been overcome by the present remarks and withdrawal thereof is respectfully requested.

#### §103 Rejection of Claim 22

In Section 4 of the Office Action, claim 22 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Lumera in view of Higgins (U.S. Patent No. 5,270,922).

Based on the foregoing discussion regarding claim 12, and since claim 22 depends from claim 12, claim 22 should be allowable over Lumera. Further, it was stated in Section 4 of the Office Action that Higgins teaches system for distributing, processing, and displaying financial information. Thus, Lumera and Higgins, individually or in combination, fail to teach or suggest generating and editing templates of media items and associated data when the plurality of environments is in a development/production environment, wherein each template includes a number of media slots, and each media slot defines a genre of media and a specific target format. Therefore, the combination of Lumera and Higgins fails to teach or suggest all the limitations of

claim 22.

Accordingly, it is submitted that the rejection of claim 22 based upon 35 U.S.C. §103(a) has been overcome by the present remarks and withdrawal thereof is respectfully requested.

§103 Rejection of Claims 28-29 and 34

In Section 5 of the Office Action, claims 28-29 and 34 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Lumera in view of Tabbara *et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 6,460,043; hereinafter referred to as “Tabbara”).

Based on the foregoing discussion regarding claims 12 and 31, and since claims 28-29 and 34 depend from claims 12 and 31, respectively, claims 28-29 and 34 should be allowable over Lumera. Further, it was stated in Section 5 of the Office Action that Tabbara teaches method and apparatus for operating on data with a conceptual data manipulation language. Thus, Lumera and Tabbara, individually or in combination, fail to teach or suggest generating and editing templates of media items and associated data when the plurality of environments is in a development/production environment, wherein each template includes a number of media slots, and each media slot defines a genre of media and a specific target format. Therefore, the combination of Lumera and Tabbara fails to teach or suggest all the limitations of claim 28-29 and 34.

Accordingly, it is submitted that the rejection of claims 28-29 and 34 based upon 35 U.S.C. §103(a) has been overcome by the present remarks and withdrawal thereof is respectfully requested.

§103 Rejection of Claim 30

In Section 6 of the Office Action, claim 30 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Lumera in view of Love *et al.* (U.S. Patent Application No. 2004/0215725).

Based on the foregoing discussion regarding claim 12, and since claim 30 depends from claim 12, claim 30 should be allowable over Lumera. Further, it was stated in Section 6 of the Office Action that Love teaches system and method for multi-platform queue queries. Thus, Lumera and Love, individually or in combination, fail to teach or suggest generating and editing templates of media items and associated data when the plurality of environments is in a development/production environment, wherein each template includes a number of media slots, and each media slot defines a genre of media and a specific target format. Therefore, the combination of Lumera and Love fails to teach or suggest all the limitations of claim 30.

Accordingly, it is submitted that the rejection of claim 30 based upon 35 U.S.C. §103(a) has been overcome by the present remarks and withdrawal thereof is respectfully requested.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, entry of this amendment, and the allowance of this application with claims 1, 2, 4-12, 14, 15, and 17-36 are respectfully solicited.

In regard to the claims amended herein and throughout the prosecution of this application, it is submitted that these claims, as originally presented, are patentably distinct over the prior art of record, and that these claims were in full compliance with the requirements of 35 U.S.C. §112. Changes that have been made to these claims were not made for the purpose of patentability within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. §§101, 102, 103 or 112. Rather, these changes

were made simply for clarification and to round out the scope of protection to which Applicant is entitled.


In the event that additional cooperation in this case may be helpful to complete its prosecution, the Examiner is cordially invited to contact Applicant's representative at the telephone number written below.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any insufficient fees or credit any overpayment associated with the above-identified application to Deposit Account 50-0320.

Respectfully submitted,

FROMMER LAWRENCE & HAUG LLP

By:

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Samuel S. Lee, Reg. No. 42,791 for  
William S. Frommer  
Reg. No. 25,506  
(212) 588-0800